CITY OF GUSTAVUS, ALASKA PROJECT SCOPING and DEVELOPMENT FORM

This form is to be used to document project planning and approval in order to assure that: project options are well-considered; the best option is put forward; initial and continuing costs and funding are addressed; and that Council approval has been given for implementation. Use this project scoping form with the Project Planning and Approval Process Flow Chart.

Answer the questions that pertain to your proposed project. Attach additional narrative pages if necessary. Type in the electronic form using as much space as you feel is necessary.

Part 1. Project Identification

Name of Project: New Main Building

City Department: Disposal & Recycling Center Contact: Paul Berry

E-mail: dumpmaster@gustavus-ak.gov Phone 907-697-2118

Part 2. Project Scope refers to a project's size, goals, and requirements. It identifies what the project is supposed to accomplish and the estimated budget (of time and money) necessary to achieve these goals. Changes in scope will need Council approval.

What is the project? To construct a new main building of 6,000SF with at least 2 bays and 1 man-door and put it in operation.

What are its goals and objectives?
 Goal: The existing main building is too small to safely operate the functions of the DRC.
 The goal of the project is to construct the new building providing adequate, safe space for customers and staff.

The objectives will be as follows:

- 1. Purchase the building kit (metal building)
- 2. Perform site development to provide the pad for the building
- 3. Install necessary infrastructure such as 3-phase power and other electrical work, foundation
- Who/what will be aided by this project? Who are the targeted stakeholders/customers? The community of Gustavus, the customer, will see the most benefit. As demand for access to the inflow area of the DRC increases, operating space is reduced. In addition, the existing building does not provide space for equipment necessary to maintain the growth in volume of material. Operators will also benefit because they will be able to do their job without the anxiety created by a crowded space.
- Is a preliminary survey necessary to identify the number of potential customers/users? How will you design and conduct the survey? No.

• What is NOT covered by this project? What are its boundaries? The building is only part of the project. The next steps will be to equip the DRC with the necessary machines to safely and productively conduct the business of the DRC (sort, process, dispose). Beyond the routine operations of the DRC, plans need to be made for changing the priority of disposal of landfill material which is currently happening in the local mound to shipment to a larger, regional landfill. This is a process similar to other communities in Southeast Alaska such as Petersburg, Wrangel, Sitka, Thorne Bay and Ketchikan. Utilizing best practices will extend the life of the DRC's existing mound and plans for the exporting of solid waste should begin soon. This will be the final phase of the Solid Waste Management Plan.

2. Why is the project needed?

What community problem, need, or opportunity will it address? Recycling is the cornerstone of the City's Disposal & Recycling Center and the DRC has need for improving public safety, operator safety and operator efficiency by separating the public and DRC Operator work areas. The Operator should not have to pass through public work areas to store or retrieve recyclable materials and situations where the Operator has to drive equipment though the public work areas to retrieve or store bins of recyclables should be avoided.

Volume of material has increased and the forecast for growth indicates significant demand on the DRC services. As population increases (full-time, seasonal, business,

POPULATION GROWTH

600

400

200

1980

1990

2000

2010

2015

and visitors), so will the material, and therefore the services of the DRC.

Growth of full-time residents have been steady, sitting between 442-425 until 2015. However, between 2015 and 2018 there has been a spike in growth to 554¹. Explanation of the recent growth does not appear to be attributed to any single trend; it is likely that the growth is the

result of multiple factors. Using traditional methods of forecasting population growth is difficult given the economic climate of the national, state, and local inconsistencies of the economy. In addition, there are variables of growth that will likely determine the growth curve in the next few years. For example, the Frontcountry Plan of the Glacier Bay National Park and Preserve (Park) could have a significant impact to both population growth and solid waste demand.

¹ DCCED Certified Population Counts https://dcra-cdo-dcced.opendata.arcgis.com/ datasets/dcced-certified-population-counts-all-locations/data?geometry=-135.78%2C58.409%2C-135.698%2C58.417&orderBy=Population&selectedAttribute= Population



Solid waste in Gustavus has been steady since 2010. From 2008 to 2015 there was a small increase in the amount of material delivered to the DRC. However, in 2018 and 2019 there was a significant proportional increase in non-recyclable material. Although there are several possible explanations, there has not been

an event or development trend that would clearly identify the growth.

Forecasting difficulty is similar for solid waste. Possible explanations for the trend may include the growth in population. It is not clear if the AMHS has played a role in the trend but the arrival of the ferry in 2010 does show a correlation between its service to Gustavus and an increase in both population and pounds of waste received.

Forecasting difficulty is similar for solid waste. Possible explanations for the trend may include the growth in population. It is not clear if the AMHS has played a role in the trend but the arrival of the ferry in 2010 does show a correlation between its service to Gustavus and an increase in both population and pounds of waste received by the DRC.

Forecasting Increase of Solid Waste: A typical practice of forecasting would be to take the average of yearly growth and apply it to each of the forecasted years. The Pounds of Waste Received graph above uses dates significant to recent growth in waste volume. For example, the Alaska Marine Highway System started in Gustavus in late 2010 so that date was selected for a baseline. 2015 was selected as a 5-yr period that provided a period of data with consistent population growth. 2018 and 2019 were selected because they provide recent data. Using this data, the average increase in the pounds of waste increases approximately 6% for non-recycled waste and 1.5% per year for recycled waste. Below is a calculation for growth over the next 10-years. However, given the inconsistency with variables that could impact results, the forecast is provided given some uncertainty.

Although the forecast may have a low degree of confidence, the realization that sold waste – both recycle and non-recycle material will continue to increase. It may not be at the volume identified by the forecast but the fact that it will increase substantially over the 10-year window requires that actions be taken to assure viability.

| | | | NON-RECYCLE | | | | | | | |
|---------|---------|---------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 | 2026 | 2027 | 2028 | 2029 | 2030 |
| 154,692 | 163,788 | 173,419 | 183,616 | 194,413 | 205,845 | 217,949 | 230,765 | 244,335 | 258,702 | 273,914 |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | RECYCLE | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 | 2026 | 2027 | 2028 | 2029 | 2030 |
| 197,197 | 200,020 | 202,884 | 205,789 | 208,735 | 211,723 | 214,755 | 217,829 | 220,948 | 224,111 | 227,320 |

The City recognizes that expansion of the DRC is inevitable to keep pace with growth of the expansion. There continues to be a small percentage of residents that don't utilize the DRC and it is likely that refuse is either burned or buried on-site. Avoiding illegal dumping

and undesirable impacts to adjacent properties are factors to be addressed when considering expansion.

Additionally, the DRC can look to income-producing uses of landfill items. For example, investing in machinery, such as a shredder and briquette maker would provide for the processing of cardboard and other select materials into a form of fuel that could be used in local wood stoves for heat and lowering heating oil costs. The investments would also assist in disposing materials that cannot be recycled or reused. For example, the shredder would densify wastes that are otherwise landfilled such as rigid plastics or treated lumber.

The DRC inflow storage is an example of inadequate space. Inflow storage (formerly called pre-processing storage) is the term used to describe both the physical area and the methodology used to hold recyclable materials (scrap metal, aluminum cans etc.) prior to their processing. Our current material holding methods include large plastic bags inside a 20' shipping container, dozens of 48"x45"x36" collapsible bulk storage containers or "bins" and a variety of old totes, an open skiff, a plywood box, an old stock tank and disposable, short-life "super-sacks".

The DRC's current inflow storage area is scattered throughout the facility - some bins are stored beside the main building while other bins are inside the fenced area. This presents several problems: as the fenced landfill area continues to be used for waste burial these holding areas will have to move elsewhere and having the bins stored away from the main building means the operator has to pass through public-use areas to retrieve or store bins during the day which as mentioned previously presents a safety concern. It is also desirable to have inflow storage as close as possible to the facility where the material will be processed.

- What health, safety, environmental, compliance, infrastructure, or economic problems or opportunities does it address? The public safety considerations of the operations within the main building were illustrated above. It is very important to separate public use areas and operator use areas.
- 3. Where did the idea for this project originate? (Public comments, Council direction, committee work?)

DRC Manager/ Operator Paul Berry.

4. Is this project part of a larger plan? (For example, the Gustavus Community Strategic Plan, or committee Annual Work Plan?)

This project is part of the ongoing Solid Waste Management Plan being conducted by the DRC Manager/Operator.

- 5. What is your timeline for project planning?
 - By when do you hope to implement the project? To ensure that high-season operations are interrupted as little as possible, the project will be constructed when the best opportunities are available. Variables such as receipt of the building package, when the construction team can erect the building, when the ground would allow the site development to coincide with the building construction, etc. will drive specific timing. However, it is expected to be operational by September 2021.

- Will the planning or final project occur in phases or stages? Addressed above.
- 6. What is your budget for the planning process? Will you be using a consultant? The building comes with an Alaska engineer stamp so no design review will be necessary. However, there is need to work with individuals familiar to a general layout of landfill buildings. There will be the need for contractors.
- 7. What is your rough estimate of the total cost of the planning and final product? At the least, please list cost categories. See Part 4. (Ques. 4-8) and Part 5 (Budget) for guidance.

| overruin @2070 continigency \$07,000 | |
|---|--|
| Overrun @25% contingency \$57,500 | |
| Demolition of existing building \$20,000 | |
| Site development & Infrastructure \$100,000 | |
| Assembly/Construction of building \$30,000 | |
| Building from Future/Toro (Michigan) delivered \$80,000 | |

Parts 3., 4., 5., 6. Project Investigation and Development

Parts 3.-6. refer to social, environmental, and financial impacts of various options. These questions will help you document your consideration of alternatives and your choice of the option providing the best value for the community. Your goal is to generate alternatives and make a recommendation from among them. Return to Part 3., "Summary" after applying Parts 4.-6.

Summary:

1. What alternative approaches or solutions were considered? Make a business case for your top two or three options by discussing how effectively each would fulfill the project goals, and by comparing the economic, social, and environmental costs vs. benefits of each one.

The alternatives chosen are as follows:

Do nothing – this is not sustainable and could lead to accidents and injury, failure to execute the purpose of the DRC, operational inefficiency ultimately costing more money to operate.

Execute the proposal – execute planning for future use and current sustainability. Extend the existing building – extending the existing building would mean the purchase of smaller building. This approach only reduces the cost of the building, the existing build would need repair and may not resolve operating space issue. This "band-aid" approach does not address the long-term need, nor would it provide for an effective and efficient processing of solid waste.

2. What solution was chosen as the best and why is it the best?

The proposal provides for a long-term solution to the necessary space for the next 20-years. The DRC is a regional and state example of recycling and solid waste disposal for rural communities because of the years of developing environmental best practices. The cost of steel is currently affordable, the timing is optimal for attaining the necessary space.

Perhaps more importantly, with the Frontcountry plan going into action in 2020 and the project growth as discussed above, the DRC needs significant improvement to address the demand. Safety of patrons and operators should not be ignored as increase in materials will result in more people in conflict with operations.

- 3. Identify your funding source(s).
 - How will the project be funded initially, and for its operating life? The funding source is the CIP funds traditionally used. However, grant opportunities will continue to be sought.

During the upcoming FY21 budgeting process the DRC will propose to include a funding mechanism to account for the large users. The large users drive the requirement for additional staffing, load on equipment, space in the landfill, shipping of recyclables, etc. The impact of seasonal customers is felt by the residents and smaller businesses that require "routine" processing. That is, processing that can be accomplished within normal operations, without additional staff or operating hours, or cost.

• Is there a matching fund requirement? Please provide details. No.

Part 4. Environmental, Social, Financial Impacts

1. Project Impacts Checklist

| Will this project affect: | No | Yes (+/-) | Maybe |
|--|----|-----------|-------|
| Environmental quality? | | | |
| (+ = impact is beneficial; - = harmful) | | | |
| Climate change | | | + |
| Streams/groundwater quality | | | + |
| Air quality | | | + |
| Soils/land quality | | | + |
| Fish/wildlife habitat, populations | | | + |
| • Plant Resources (timber, firewood, berries, etc) | | | + |
| Invasive or pest species | | | + |
| Natural beauty of landscape or neighborhoods | | | + |
| Neighborhood character | | | + |
| Noise or other environmental impacts | | | + |
| Environmental sustainability | | | + |
| Hazardous substances use | + | | |
| Community waste stream | | + | |
| Light pollution at night | + | | |
| Recreational opportunities? | | | |
| Public land use and access | | | + |
| Trails/waterways | | | + |
| Parks | + | | |
| Public assembly/activities | + | | |
| Education/training/knowledge & skill development? | + | | |

| Public safety? | | | + |
|--|---|---|---|
| Public health? | | + | |
| Medical services? | | | + |
| Emergency response? | | | + |
| Economic performance & sustainability? | | | + |
| Employment of residents | | + | |
| Short-term (i.e. construction) | | + | |
| Long-term (operating and maintenance) | + | | |
| Cost of living reduction | + | | |
| Return on investment | | + | |
| Visitor opportunities/impressions/stays/ purchases | | + | |
| Competitive business environment | + | | |
| Support for existing businesses | | + | |
| New business opportunities | + | | |
| Economic sustainability | | | + |
| Attractiveness of City to new | | + | |
| residents/businesses | | | |
| City government performance? | | | |
| Infrastructure quality/effectiveness/reach | | + | |
| (more people) | | | |
| Existing services | | + | |
| New services | + | | |
| Cost of City services | + | | |
| Tax income to City | + | | |
| Transportation? | | | |
| • Air | + | | |
| Water | + | | |
| • Roads | + | | |
| Communications? | | | |
| • Internet | + | | |
| • Phone | + | | |
| • TV/radio | + | | |
| Other? (type in) | | | |

3. How does this project provide benefits or add value in multiple areas? (E.g., benefits both to the environment and to business performance.)

The "Maybe" indicators of the above Table reflect the benefits of the project. If the DRC operating model doesn't change to accommodate the increased demand, community members may choose to dispose of solid waste in a non-environmentally sustainable way such as discarding waste in the woods or along trails (currently happening); burying materials on-site of their homes/businesses (currently happening); burning trash in pits or barrels (currently happening). These alternative methods do not reflect well on Gustavus and likely have negative environmental impacts.

- 4. Are other projects related to or dependent on this project? No.
- Is this project dependent on other activities or actions?

- If yes, describe projects, action or activities specifying phases where appropriate.
- 5. Will the project require additional infrastructure, activity, or staffing outside the immediate department or activity? (e.g., will the construction of a new facility require additional roads or road maintenance or more internal City staffing?) No.
- 6. What regulatory permits will be required and how will they be obtained? None.
- 7. What are the estimated initial (e.g., construction or purchase) and continuing operational costs of the project? To complete the DRC site there will be the need for new equipment to replace failing, undersized and ineffective machines such as the baler (belongs to the Park), new Hazardous Waste storage, complete ongoing and/or additional projects like the Quonset building, composting building, and storage area.
- 8. Is an engineering design or construction estimate necessary? Not for the building but may be necessary for site improvements.
- 9. Will operation of the project generate any revenue for the City such as sales, user fees, or new taxes? If so, how will the new revenue be collected? **As discussed in #3 above**.

Part 5. Project Budget

See budget above in Part 2, 7

Proposed Budget Line Items

| Construction project Budget estimate | Cost | Operational budget estimate (annual) | Cost |
|--|-----------|--------------------------------------|----------|
| Administrative | \$ | Personnel | \$ |
| Project management Land, structures, ROW, easements | \$20,000 | Benefits Training | \$ \$ |
| Engineering work | \$20,000 | Travel | \$ |
| Permitting, inspection | | Equipment | \$ |
| Site work | \$100,000 | Contractual | \$ |
| Construction | \$30,000 | Supplies | \$ |
| Waste disposal | \$ | Utilities | \$ |
| Equipment | \$ | Insurance | \$ |
| Freight | \$ | Repair & maintenance | \$ |
| Contingencies | \$57,500 | Other (list) | \$ |
| Other (list) Building | \$80,000 | Other (list) | \$ |
| Other (list) | | Total direct costs | \$ |
| | | Indirect costs | \$ |
| | | Income (fees, taxes) | \$ |
| | | Balance: costs-income | \$ |
| | | | |

Updated Latest Estimate Budget Line Items if Changed Date: _____

| Construction project Budget estimate | Cost | Operational budget estimate (annual) | Cost |
|---|------|--------------------------------------|------|
| Administrative | \$ | Personnel | \$ |
| Project management | \$ | Benefits | \$ |
| Land, structures, ROW, easements | \$ | Training | \$ |
| Engineering work | \$ | Travel | \$ |
| Permitting; inspection | | Equipment | \$ |
| Site work | \$ | Contractual | \$ |
| Demolition and construction | \$ | Supplies | \$ |
| Waste disposal | \$ | Utilities | \$ |
| Equipment | \$ | Insurance | \$ |
| Freight | \$ | Repair & maintenance | \$ |
| Contingencies | \$ | Other (list) | \$ |
| Other (list) | \$ | Total direct costs | |
| | | Indirect costs | |
| | | Income (fees, taxes) | \$ |
| | | Balance: costs-income | \$ |
| | | | |

Part 6. Jobs and Training (required by some granting agencies)

| 1. What service jobs will be needed for operation and maintenance? I |
|--|
|--|

| 2. | How many full-time, p | permanent jobs | will this | project | create | or retain? | DRC staff. |
|----|-----------------------|----------------|-----------|---------|--------|------------|------------|
| | Create/retain | in 1-3 years | | | | | |
| | Create/retain | in 3-5 years | | | | | |

3. What training is necessary to prepare local residents for jobs on this project? None

4. How many local businesses will be affected by this project and how? Most of them.

Part 7. Business Plan (Upon Council request)

Upon Council request, please prepare a business plan for the operating phase of your leading option(s). Plans will differ according to the nature of the project.

There are a number of good Internet sites that will assist you in developing a business plan. One example (12/2010): http://www.va-interactive.com/inbusiness/editorial/bizdev/ibt/business_plan.html

Basic components of a business plan:

- The Product/Service
- The Market
- The Marketing Plan
- The Competition
- Operations
- The Management Team
- Personnel

Part 8. Record of Project Planning and Development Meetings

- 1. Please document the manner in which public input was received.
 - Public comment on agenda item at committee or Council meeting
 - Special public hearing
 - Dates and attendance for the above.
 - Written comment from the public (please attach)
- 2. Please use the following chart to document committee meetings, Council reports, and so on. Did the committee make recommendations or requests? Did the Council make requests of the committee?

Meeting Record

| meeting record | | | | 1 | |
|------------------------|------|--------|-----------|---------------|-----------|
| Event | Date | Agenda | Minutes | Outcome | No. of |
| (Meeting of committee, | | Posted | or record | Rec to | attendees |
| Council report, public | | (date) | attached? | Council, | |
| hearing, etc. | | | (yes/no) | requested | |
| | | | | action of | |
| | | | | Council, etc. | |
| City Council General | | | | | |
| Meeting | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| City Council General | | | | | |
| Meeting | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

Part 9. Feedback to the Council

With the understanding that this form must be adapted to a variety of projects, please provide feedback on how the form worked for your committee. Thank you for your suggestions.